

MAR 28 2008

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.  
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW1100 13<sup>TH</sup> STREET, N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005TEL: 202.824-3000  
FAX: 202.824-3001  
www.bannerwitcoff.com

---

FACSIMILE TRANSMITTAL SHEET

---

To:  
Examiner Habte MeredFROM:  
Bradley C. WrightCOMPANY:  
USPTODATE:  
March 28, 2008FAX NUMBER:  
571-273-8300

TOTAL NO. OF PAGES (INCLUDING COVER SHEET):

YOUR REFERENCE NO.:

OUR REFERENCE (C/M) NO.:

Re:

Serial No. 10/663,378

If you do not receive all page(s) or have any problems receiving this transmission, please call:

NAME: Vicki van de Veerdonk PHONE: (202)-824-3241

COMMENTS:

PLEASE FORWARD TO EXAMINER HABTE MERED IN PREPARATION FOR THIS MORNING'S INTERVIEW IN SERIAL NO. 10/663,378

**IMPORTANT/CONFIDENTIAL:** This message is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to whom it is addressed. This message contains information from the law firm of BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD. which may be privileged, confidential or exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, retention, archiving, or copying of the communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately at our telephone number listed above. We will be happy to arrange for the return of this message to our offices at no cost to you.

CHICAGO

WASHINGTON, D.C.

BOSTON

PORTLAND,  
OR

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAR 28 2008

**PROPOSED AGENDA FOR INTERVIEW IN 10/663,378**  
**TO BE HELD AT 10:30AM ON MARCH 28,2008**

Dear Examiner Mered:

Here is the proposed agenda for our interview to be held this morning in this case. It is my understanding that the participants will be (1) you; (2) me; (3) your supervisor; and (4) Steven Rogers (the inventor).

1. Brief discussion of problem solved by the invention and video demonstration.
2. Whether Klassen evaluates which of a plurality of "time slots" corresponds to favorable network traffic conditions," including the meaning of "time slot" as understood by a person of skill in the art.
3. Whether independent claim 37, which specifically recites evaluating packet statistics for test packets transmitted "over a plurality of time slots corresponding to candidate times during which packets may be transmitted between network endpoints on the network" is shown by Klassen's mention of a "best network time" measurement as alleged on page 4 of the Advisory Action.
4. Whether either Klassen or Barton discloses transmitting packets using favorable time slots that were previously evaluated, and specifically the statement at the top of page 5 of the advisory action that, "Barton in paragraph 86 shows or suggests how the specific time slots are selected tying it to Klassen's method of selecting best network time interval or time slot."
5. Whether Barton, which requires each node to reserve times for packet transmission, is relevant to the claimed invention.